

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 7-11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Namma et al. (US 6,185,616) in view of Veerina et al (US 6,243,379).

Claims 1-4 have been cancelled, thus mooted the rejection of those claims. Independent claim 7 has been amended to claim an apparatus for providing connectivity to the Internet over a high speed access network comprising a protocol stack for receiving a request from a computer device for an IP address, wherein the request *contains point-to-point (PPP) messages encapsulated over Ethernet packets*; and b) a translator for translating the *PPP messages into dynamic host configuration protocol (DHCP) messages to request an IP address*. Applicant submits that neither Namma et al. nor Veerina et al., either alone or in combination, discloses or suggests an apparatus that translates PPP messages encapsulated over Ethernet packets to DHCP messages to request an IP address for connectivity to the Internet.

As the Examiner admitted, Namma does not disclose translating a request for an IP address from a format compatible with a WAN into a LAN compatible address, and thus, does not disclose translating PPP messages into DHCP messages to request an IP address. Veerina likewise does not disclose translating PPP messages into DHCP messages to request an IP address. As the Examiner points out on page 5, lines 6-18, Veerina teaches a network address translator router device between a wide area network and a local area network. The network address translator router device includes an outbound handler, incoming handler and an IP translation table wherein the outbound handler and incoming handler modify the destination address and port number for an outbound packet or inbound packet. Veerina does not teach translating PPP messages to DHCP messages to request an IP address. In fact, Veerina does not mention PPP or DHCP. On page 5, line 18 to page 6, line 7, the Examiner appears to assert that Applicant's claim 7 step of translating PPP messages to DHCP messages to request an IP address is well known in the art.

Applicant respectfully disagrees and requests that the Examiner cite prior art that shows this step.

Claims 9 and 10 depend on claim 7. As such, Applicant asserts that claims 9 and 10 are allowable at least by virtue of the reasons provided above.

Regarding claims 11 and 13, the Examiner rejected the claims for the same reasons as apparatus claims 7-10. Applicant asserts that claims 11 and 13 are allowable for the same reasons as provided above for claims 7-10

Applicant requests the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please charge any fees associated herewith, including extension of time fees, to 50-2117.

Respectfully submitted,
May, Lauren

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
Law Department

Customer Number: 22917

By: 
Lalita W. Pace
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 39,427
Telephone: 847-538-5855
Fax: 847-576-3750